

0097

552421

8 MS. VAN RONK: I'm here.

9 MODERATOR BROWN: John Carberry, then  
10 Marjorie Detraz, I believe, and Louis Benezet.

11 MS. VAN RONK: I hate this. I have five  
12 minutes to put a stop to the building of the nuke dump.

13 This is called "Total System Performance  
14 Assessment." And it's put out by the U.S. DOE Office  
15 of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management and I didn't  
16 read the damn thing. Instead, I have a letter here  
17 written by George M. Hornberger, chairman of the  
18 Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste. And the committee  
19 is prepared to discuss the issues in this letter with  
20 the NRC staff. It's written to the Honorable Richard  
21 A. Meserve, chairman of U.S. Nuclear Regulatory  
22 Commission.

23 And some of the things that he says in it  
24 make me glad I didn't waste any time or brain power  
25 trying to read this thing. The sort of documents the

0098

1 findings of the Advisory Commission on Nuclear Waste --  
2 vertical slice review of the TSPA SR. That's this  
3 thing. The committee, let me see -- the Advisory

---

552421

4 Committee, the committee has not yet reviewed the SSPA  
5 report that Supplemental Science and Performance  
6 Analysis, although we do currently have access to it,  
7 all of which is very nice.

8 In developing the TSPA, DOE performed an  
9 extensive amount of modeling and now I don't know what  
10 modeling is. I don't think they've used that clay that  
11 the little kids use. I think they use computers,  
12 because they don't know what else to do. So they have  
13 to have something. The TSPA does not lead to a  
14 realistic risk informed result and it does not inspire  
15 confidence in the TSPA SR process.

16 So much for this thing. I'm glad I didn't  
17 read it. In particular, the TSPA SR reflects the input  
18 and results of models and assumptions that are not  
19 founded on a realistic assessment of the evidence. The  
20 consequence is that the TSPA SR does not provide a  
21 basis for estimating margins of safety. Oh, it's safe,  
22 isn't it? Uh-huh.

23 Modeling is guided by an inconsistent set of  
24 assumptions. Now, remember we are, depending upon the  
25 scientists who tell us what is safe to build the nuke  
0099

552421

1 dump and they're working on inconsistent assumptions.  
2 Some scientists. Assumptions mask a realistic  
3 assessment and reasonableness. They have to do with  
4 mixing conservative and non-conservative bounding  
5 analyses in the general treatment of uncertainty.

6 Well, the TSPA SR analysts realize a masking  
7 problem and the inconsistency with respect to realistic  
8 assumptions. They fail to convey the expected risk  
9 based on the available evidence and that means that  
10 this stuff has to be packaged, hauled across the nation  
11 from how many, 40-some sites, up here to our backyard  
12 and stay there for half million years.

13 When modeling involves linear systems, an  
14 independent processes, the application of this approach  
15 to the high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain --  
16 make no mistake, they are talking about the nuke dump  
17 -- may be flawed. This is because the underlying  
18 process is in the near field of the repository are not  
19 entirely linear or independent.

20 So the contrary, significant coupling is  
21 expected among non-linear hydrological chemical and  
22 thermal processes. Determining what is conservative  
23 and what is not under these conditions is neither

552421

24 intuitive nor straightforward.

25 Science is supposed to be based on fact, I

0100

1 thought, and these people are talking about it being

2 intuitive. It's not straightforward, says the

3 President of the Advisory Committee. That means that

4 somebody is lying. The masking of realism. That means

5 a lie, in the TSPA SR precludes providing a clear basis

6 for estimating the margin of safety or making an

7 objective regulatory decision that is in the best

8 public interest.

9 I think that means they don't know what the

10 hell they're doing, which I have said in this room

11 before. And, therefore, they tell lies about it. The

12 absence of a simple model for the dominant dose

13 contributes greatly handicaps verification and

14 confidence in the performance assessment results.

15 That's about it. The chairman of the Advisory

16 Committee on nuclear waste doesn't seem to like this,

17 but he's willing to discuss it with the DOE. And I

18 hope that that's the way it goes.